INTERNATIONAL CONCILIATION

Published monthly by the
American Association for International Conciliation.
Entered as second class matter at New York, N. Y.,
Postoffice, February 23, 1909, under act of July 16, 1894

PHILOSOPHY OF THE THIRD AMERICAN PEACE CONGRESS

BY

THEODORE MARBURG

MAY, 1912, No. 54

American Association for International Conciliation
Sub-station 84 (407 West 117th Street)
New York City

The Executive Committee of the Association for International Conciliation wish to arouse the interest of the American people in the progress of the movement for promoting international peace and relations of comity and good fellowship between nations. To this end they print and circulate documents giving information as to the progress of these movements, in order that individual citizens, the newspaper press, and organizations of various kinds may have readily available accurate information on these subjects. A list of publications will be found on p. 31.

Theodore Marburg was born in Baltimore in 1862, and has been identified with all that is best in the life of that city. He was the organizer of the Municipal Art Society of Baltimore, of the American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, and of the Maryland Peace Society.

The success of the Third American Peace Congress held in Baltimore was largely due to his efforts. Mr. Marburg's review of the leading ideas of this Congress will, it is believed, be of interest to the readers of the publications of this Association, and will be of particular value to those who use the pamphlets as a preparation for debate or public speaking.

PHILOSOPHY OF THE THIRD AMERICAN PEACE CONGRESS

The aim of the peace movement is not a subject of controversy. Where difference of opinion enters is as to method: whether armaments or courts are the best instruments for preserving peace. And here the militarists have been put on the defensive; *i.e.*, armaments, as well as war, are universally recognized as an evil to be dispensed with just as soon as a practical plan for their suppression presents itself.

War involves biological and moral loss as well as economic loss. The reign of law between nations would promote the cause of justice by extending its sway, by increasing men's respect for, and love of, justice, and by strengthening the habit of doing justice. The new system is already partly inaugurated and must prevail; but armaments will be maintained while it is being put to the test.[1]

The period of time this process will occupy will depend on the extent to which men direct their energies toward it and especially on the measure of attention they succeed in getting their statesmen to give to it. When conditions are ripe the act of a single man charged with power may advance a cause a full generation. If, on the other hand, the opportune moment is allowed to pass, a series of untoward events may distract and discourage its advocates and divert the popular interest.

The most pressing peace measure before the country today is the proposed all-inclusive treaty of arbitration with Great Britain.[2] A common language, literature, and kinship of institutions and law, all offer reasons why this treaty should be consummated. These two countries have been more happy than others "in reconciling and adjusting legitimate au-

[1] Richard Bartholdt. [2] Theodore E. Burton.

thority with personal liberty."[3] Such a treaty will not only insure peace between the two contracting nations, but by offering an example which other nations are bound to follow "will prepare the way for enduring peace throughout the world."[4] It may therefore prove to be an epoch-making event.

"The only way for a man to rise above the presidency of the United States is to ascend into the international realm."[5] This President Taft has done by the utterance of which the pending treaty with Great Britain is the outcome: namely, his declaration in favor of a treaty with some power by which all questions not resolvable by diplomacy shall be referred to an arbitral court. President Taft has laid the axe "to the root of international war."[6] But such a treaty must not be regarded as bringing an end to war at once.[7] It is only a step toward the goal "to be followed by other steps as rapidly as possible." Now that mediation is recognized as a friendly act and a duty, the various chancelleries of the world are themselves agencies for the promotion of peace. Having become a powerful nation the United States has duties to discharge to weaker nations and a responsibility for the peace of the world in its neighborhood. With the aid of certain South American countries it has during the present administration succeeded in averting wars in four separate instances.[8, 9]

A great source of war today is found in the governments which "do not exercise complete control over their people." It is the duty of the United States and of the other great republics in the two Americas to exercise their "kindly and peaceful influence to prevent such outbreaks." Unfortunately suspicion is cast on the motive of the United States in tendering its good offices, a suspicion which is baseless because we

[3] James Cardinal Gibbons.
[4] James Cardinal Gibbons.
[5] Hamilton Holt.
[6] Andrew Carnegie.
[7] President Taft.
[8] President Taft.
[9] Huntington Wilson.

have ample territory in which to work out the experiment of popular government and there is therefore among us an entire absence of any desire for aggrandizement of territory.[10] While interference in the internal affairs of a state has been a prolific source of oppression and of war in the past, it is equally true that a broad rule of non-interference is unworkable.[11] Misgovernment is bound to lead to foreign complications. It was the injustice and oppression practiced by the Turkish state which drew down upon Turkey the vengeance of other powers. If just government had obtained in Cuba the island would still belong to Spain; and unless the Johannesberger had been oppressively taxed there would have been no South African war. Why is it that there is danger of interference by the United States in the internal affairs of Mexico and no such danger with respect to Canada where there is an ever-growing number of Americans?

Is it not simply because of the difference with which justice is meted out by the law and the courts in the two countries? The modern world insists upon a standard of government as well as upon a standard of living. "Peace rests on justice" and not on the "international figment that the internal affairs of a nation are of no consequence to another."[12] It cannot be secured by machinery which leaves "unavenged and unredressed the misery of millions and the worst of all human wrongs, injustice at the fount of justice, spoliation under the guise of taxation" and the denial of rights to men. This principle is definitely set up in the Platt Amendment by which the United States requires of Cuba the stamping out of pestilence, the maintenance of order and the enforcement of contracts. It would be well to extend the principle by organizing under an international commission all countries whose protracted internal disorder makes of

[10] President Taft.
[11] Talcott Williams.
[12] Talcott Williams.

them danger-points.[13] Such a commission would make more secure the independence of such countries by taking away the excuse for interference on the part of a single power whose act may result in permanent occupation with or without previous intent.

War is a plentiful source of injustice and suffering, but it is not the only source.[14] There may be a steady denial of justice which results in profound human misery. In time of peace there may be actual loss of life—as in the massacres in Turkey—greater than that which results from war. War is to be condemned especially because it is such a source of injustice; but "what we are seeking is first justice and next peace."[15] Disarmament must therefore follow the establishment of justice, not precede it. Men laid aside their rapiers when they found they were safe without them. Just so armaments will drop away of their own accord when they are no longer needed.[16] We all desire to see the rule of reason supplant the rule of force, but suppose there is no reason? "You cannot appeal to reason when facing a pack of wolves." Within the leading nations, as a rule, there is internal order, a love of justice and respect for law. Between certain of them the rule of reason has likewise long prevailed in external relations, and as to such states it is quite safe to set up treaties which provide for the peaceful settlements of all disputes between them.[17]

Ignorance of each other is a source of distrust. Mixture of upright intentions and downright ignorance produces folly. We can do much for peace by simply knowing each other better.[18] As great as will be the uses of the Panama Canal as a commercial artery, they will be outweighed by its usefulness in bringing the nations closer together.[19]

[13] Talcott Williams.
[14] Lyman Abbott.
[15] Lyman Abbott.
[16] Price Collier.
[17] Lyman Abbott.
[18] Price Collier.
[19] Champ Clark.

The Pan-American Union, devoted to the development of commerce among the twenty-one nations of the western hemisphere, acts upon this principle. The seven million people who compose Latin America are looking to the United States for leadership and sympathy and help, and the Union aims to be the channel through which it may all flow.[20]

The frequent internal disturbances in South American countries must not blind us to the fact that in international relations they have displayed forbearance and a sense of justice of a high order.[21] In the past three generations the map of South America has not changed nearly so much as the map of Europe. If the methods which were applied to Poland had obtained at the end of the war between Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay on the one hand, and Paraguay on the other, the latter country would have been effaced from the map of South America. Despite the fact that Paraguay was the aggressor, no territory was taken from it. Its victors magnanimously recognized the fact that the conflict was due to the acts of a dictator and they refused to penalize a people simply because they were in a backward stage of political development.[22]

In South America it is not so much the conscious desire to appropriate another state's territory as the uncertainty as to where the boundary line runs that leads to difficulty. The dense tropical jungles of the interior are only now being explored and shadowy territorial claims are found to conflict. What is needed is a geographical delimitation of boundaries[23] to be followed by an agreement that hereafter in the two Americas "no territory shall be transferred as a consequence of war."[24]

Like geographical delimitation of boundaries is needed in Africa and Asia. For example, in the case

[20] John Barrett.
[21] Leo. S. Rowe.
[22] Leo. S. Rowe.
[23] Charles C. Yates.
[24] James L. Slayden.

of the Chinese Empire, her "practically unmarked and geographically undefined boundaries" extend more than eight thousand miles, abutting the possessions of the British, French, Germans, Portuguese, Russians and Japanese.[25]

The Monroe Doctrine should not be used as an excuse for undue interference in the affairs of Latin America nor for imposing on it our own views of government.[26] To the extent to which it retards European immigration into that region, the doctrine is injuring it. The foreigner, including the citizen of the United States, who locates in a Latin American country, has no right to claim security of person or property superior to that which the citizen of that country enjoys. He can demand only the equal protection of the laws. This applies equally to times of political upheaval and to times of peace. "If the forms of law be more rigorous than are known at home, if their manner of execution be more severe, if the government be less able than his own to insure him the blessings of liberty," be it remembered that in the eye of international law he consents to this order of things when he enters the land.[27] Spanish American countries suspect us of desiring to control their foreign relations and to regulate their internal affairs. "They have a right to demand that we shall treat them as we would have them treat us if they were strong and we were weak." [28]

The behavior of the private citizen abroad is a considerable factor in giving direction to international relations. As governmental action is influenced powerfully by popular opinion, the impression conveyed in foreign lands by honest dealing and considerate conduct on the part of the stranger, as well as the color given by newspapers to events in foreign lands, are of much importance.[29]

[25] Charles C. Yates.
[26] James L. Slayden.
[27] James L. Slayden.
[28] James L. Slayden.
[29] Huntington Wilson.

The good relations of the world are markedly promoted by candid and well-meaning diplomacy, by acts which in private life would be regarded as gentlemanly and which advance international morality; acts such as England's cession of the Ionian Islands to Greece, the withdrawal of the United States from Cuba after the latter had been aided in the difficult task of establishing an independent government, and the repayment by the United States to China of the Boxer indemnity.[30, 31]

If international institutions eventually furnish as satisfactory a method of settling disputes between nations as municipal institutions now offer for the adjustment of differences between private individuals, it is reasonable to assume that public war will disappear just as the rule of private war has disappeared.[32] The perfection of such institutions is therefore the duty of the hour. It is the practical means of attacking the problems of war and of armaments. The defect which has characterized arbitrations—namely the tendency to compromise in lieu of declaring exact justice—has been less marked since the establishment of The Hague Court which seems to feel its responsibility to act more as a court and less as an agent merely to compose differences. An analysis of nine decisions by the court leads to the conclusion that only one, the Casablanca decision, is a manifest compromise, that two others are affected with the spirit of compromise, and that the remaining six are free of this suspicion.[33] The question is raised whether compromise should not be left to the field of negotiation and whether a court should not be held strictly to the law and the facts. The establishment of a true international court of justice might, in course of time, bring this about through the gradual neglect of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The worst form of compromise is that which colors the very reasoning of the

[30] Robert Stein.
[31] Huntington Wilson.
[32] Wm. C. Dennis.
[33] William C. Dennis.

court, thereby affecting the development of international law. This tendency is encouraged by permitting the president of the court and one other official to sign the award—as under the present Hague convention—in lieu of requiring each judge to signify separately his approval not only of the award but of the reasoning of the court.

The element of compromise in arbitration may be reduced by letting the arbitrators understand that unless the terms of the submission are respected, the decision may be set aside by a higher tribunal clothed with authority to entertain an appeal; by the adoption of a code of procedure; by the exclusion of nationals from the tribunal; and by establishing either the right of challenge in the selection of judges, or, better still, the practice of selecting judges by direct agreement as provided in article 46 of The Hague convention of 1907.[34]

The peace movement is an endeavor to substitute law for force in the relations of nations, to do between the nations what has already been done within the nations.[35] To what extent actual federation of the nations is required to bring this about is at present not clear. The mind, starting with the analogy of a federal state, soon enters this domain of speculation. It finds a measure of coöperation already existing among the nations. It finds in embryo certain institutions which might readily be developed into federal institutions. Such is The Hague Peace Conference, (which will probably meet hereafter at fixed intervals,) a quasi-legislative body whose members are appointed by the executive branches of the various governments and whose conclusions have great weight with the home governments. Such again is the Interparliamentary Union, an annual unofficial gathering whose position it is proposed to strengthen by having its members selected by the various home legislatures. These two

[34] William C. Dennis. [35] Hamilton Holt.

bodies, if joined together, would thus be constituted on the principle of an upper and lower house.

Still another essential of a federated world state is found in embryo in The Hague Court which is certain of rapid growth. The least developed of the three great branches of a world state is the executive; though its beginnings are found in the international bureaus which we owe so largely to conscious effort on the part of one man, Henri La Fontaine. The policing of Morocco, the North Sea, and the Behring Sea, likewise come under this head.

Whether we shall proceed to actual world federation is not a problem for present day politics. The formation of the American Union out of a people speaking a common language and inheriting common institutions was a simple matter when compared with the problem of uniting nations which have common interests, it is true, but which are controlled by widely differing motives and ideals. The impelling motive for the union of the American colonies was defense against an outside aggressor rather than the desire to avoid armed conflict among themselves. This motive cannot exist for the great powers, including Japan and presently China, because no formidable outside enemies would remain. Moreover, is actual federation necessary to the world's peace? If the attitude of the United States toward European aggrandisement in the western hemisphere has substantially prevented European countries from waging war here, why cannot the united will of the great powers prevent it over the world generally?[36]

The creation of a deliberative assembly which shall meet periodically to help regulate international relations,[37] the firm establishment of a high court or courts to compose differences and to interpret the regulations declared by the deliberative assembly, together with an international police to operate in backward countries—a body which shall be purely a police and not a mil-

[36] W. O. Hart. [37] Hamilton Holt.

itary force—is perhaps all that is needed and all that we may safely project for the present. Force will not be needed to induce the more progressive nations to respect the award of an international tribunal. Furthermore the attempt to use it against any of the leading powers would be disastrous. The principle of the international court, once introduced, must win by sheer weight of its reasonableness. No nation which has justice for its guiding star need ever fear the award of such a tribunal. If that which a nation has done or is planning to do is just, certainly it should not hesitate to enter it. Under such a régime some of us may be restrained from doing again what we have done in the past; others of us may be allowed the fulfilment of just ambitions which powerful rivals have previously forbidden to us.

The world is changing its mind about the difficulty of submitting purely political questions to international tribunals. The two Hague Conferences not only created new machinery for dealing with international disputes, but, by that fact as well as directly, greatly enlarged the scope of arbitration by increasing the kind of questions which may be dealt with by arbitration. Questions supposedly involving national honour actually have been solved by these new institutions at The Hague, namely the Commission of Inquiry and the Permanent Court of Arbitration; and questions of national policy so often turn upon questions of fairness and justice that nations may soon learn to submit these as well. Whereas in the past peace has been preserved over wide areas by empire, *i.e.* by force, the tendency now is to preserve the peace by leaning on the power of the intellect, *i.e.* upon reason as defined by some authorized agency.[38] It is significant that we are beginning to think in terms of arbitration and the peaceful settlement of disputes rather than in terms of war. As international institutions for the settlement of disputes

[38] Edwin M. Borchard.

grow, the minds of men will turn naturally to them when difficulties arise and the possibility of war growing out of such disputes will not be the first thing on men's lips.[39, 40]

Since the Second Hague Conference the United States has been more active than any other government in promoting the establishment of institutions and practices calculated to make war difficult.[41] Secretary Root negotiated many treaties looking to the reference of future disputes to arbitration. Secretary Knox has taken the lead in endeavoring to bring into being the court of arbitral justice. The Congress, by joint resolution, invited the President of the United States to appoint a commission to consider the question of armaments and the question of coöperation by the powers to make the peace of the world more secure; and President Taft is favoring and actually negotiating an all-inclusive treaty of arbitration.

In respect of the nature and enforcement of her neutrality laws, however, the United States has not only not kept the position in advance of the world which it once enjoyed, but has fallen markedly behind the best practice.[42, 43] The wholesale participation of citizens of the United States in the revolution in a neighboring state with which we were at peace is a matter of common knowledge. They crossed and recrossed the frontier with arms, seeking temporary refuge on American soil when worsted. The President should have power to control the intercourse with other countries so as to avoid having American soil made the base of operations against such countries whether in time of insurrection or in time of war.[44] Our neutrality laws were put in their present shape in 1818. President van Buren (1833) and President Arthur (1884) both urged

[39] Frederick Lynch.
[40] Madeleine Black.
[41] Benjamin F. Trueblood.
[42] John W. Foster.
[43] Leo S. Rowe.
[44] John W. Foster.

upon Congress a revision of them. Great Britain visits with fine and imprisonment the enlistment of its citizens in the forces of a country engaged in war against another power with which it (Great Britain) is at peace; and the larger countries of Latin America have followed its lead. During the recent disorders in Uruguay its neighbor Argentina assumed an admirable attitude in this respect.[45]

As against the adoption of strict neutrality laws we are sometimes reminded that the American Colonies would not have achieved their independence except for the aid of the French. But the important assistance which France gave to us, it must be remembered, was an open and public act, amounting to an alliance against England. Lafayette's greatest service to us was in securing that alliance rather than in any personal service, however chivalrous, in the field. The government can never prevent its citizens from aiding a foreign cause which appeals to their sympathy. But backward neutrality laws and lax enforcement of existing laws certainly engender a feeling of resentment on the part of foreign governments which are made to suffer by reason of them.

America, holding aloft ideals of liberty at home, should be foremost in a liberal foreign policy.[46] Its wealth, geographical position and the fact that England, formerly its opponent, is now its best friend, gives it less excuse for failure to live up to the highest ideals in all its international relations.[47] Its actions should fit its creed. "I believe it weakens a man, a society or a nation to have purposes that find no plans."[48]

America's people are the children of so many lands that so far as blood is concerned the greater part of Europe is their mother country. That fact should excite America's interest in the welfare of Europe.[49]

[45] Leo S. Rowe.
[46] Price Collier.
[47] S. C. Mitchell.
[48] Price Collier.
[49] S. C. Mitchell.

Moreover it is not afflicted with an excess of population for which an outlet may be required. "It is in the power of America to insure the peace of the world." This is the biggest task of the twentieth century and "if America richly endowed with energy of will springing out of popular sympathy with progressive causes and exhaustless material resources, once gets a vision of the active part it can play in bringing the blessings of peace to the world" it will prove resistless.[50] To arouse the people so that they will take up this question in earnest is a long and difficult task.[51] "You can hardly expect people who do not exert themselves on the side of honest and fair dealing in local and state affairs to be alert or enthusiastic respecting those problems which call for an intelligence or a patriotism transcending the bounds of state or nation. They need to be impressed with the moral grandeur of a world united in seeking the good of mankind, and of governments honestly, sincerely, devoutly striving to establish justice."[52] It is the duty of America to reconcile outside its border the peoples it has reconciled within its borders.[53]

There is a close analogy between the growth of law between the nations and within the nations.[54] Wrong to the individual was formerly redressed by him without let or hindrance from the state. Next, the wrongful act of the individual involved a collective responsibility on the part of all related to him by blood, just as today still the acts of malevolent or stupid rulers bring out people from peaceful pursuits to be killed on the battlefield. When tribal responsibility succeeded to family responsibility an elaborate system of money compensations took the place of private or family retaliation; and gradually as society became better organized, crime and misdemeanor

[50] S. C. Mitchell.
[51] Samuel T. Dutton.
[52] Samuel T. Dutton.
[53] Henri La Fontaine.
[54] W. I. Hull.

came to be recognized as a wrong against the body politic, something which it was the business of the latter to punish. The struggle of society to regulate private war was long and arduous. The trial by ordeal of fire and water allowed to ecclesiastical courts, and the trial by battle, both practised for such a long period of time as supposed methods of inviting divine intervention in favor of the right, are looked upon now as the crude inventions of a stupid age. But are we not equally stupid today when we resort to war between nations as a means of determining the right or wrong in an international dispute? The work of evolving between the nations a system of justice such as obtains within the nations is still before us. We have still to lay down the principle that a wrong by one state against another is a matter with which the society of nations must concern itself; that the International Commission of Inquiry, like the grand jury in English municipal law, must not stop with the inquiry but must evolve eventually a body which shall exist for the purpose of passing upon international wrong-doing, and must present the culprit for trial by a permanently constituted tribunal; that, in other words, the society of nations and not the individual nation will set right an international wrong.[55] Under such a system occasional miscarriage of justice may be expected exactly as in municipal law; but how insignificant will this be when compared with the wholesale injustice, private and public, which flows from war. So, too, must we expect an occasional war on a mighty scale when numbers of states shall be divided on a question, just as we have civil war today within the state; but such catastrophes should be increasingly rare.

A modern development which is most promising for the eventual peace of the world is the growing extent to which political power is passing from a ruling class into the hands of the people, from those who stand

[55] W. I. Hull.

to gain by war to those who forever stand to lose by it.[56]

Immanuel Kant remarked long ago that wars would not cease till autocratic government ceased. The problem now is to get the people to think on their political affairs and not follow their leaders blindly. It is the informed will of the people and not the emotional will of the people that must lead to higher things in government. Even today in the very best governed countries the people are still the last body to trust when the war spirit is abroad. The most conservative body in a democracy is the elective cabinet. Its chief and its members know that no matter what the popular passion or the passing vagaries of the legislature, it is they, the cabinet, who will be pilloried before history and held responsible for an unjust or disastrous war.

This state of things may be changed. The dangerous flaming up of popular passion into an appetite for war is possible only because the masses do not measure the consequences either of war or peace. They are too quick to rush to war, and, if reverses come, are too quick to tire of it. There is still unreasoning assent to the leadership of demagogues. The average man "has the impression that he is not in a position to know the facts and that, if he did know them, he would not be qualified to reach a proper conclusion" about war and peace. When war is threatening the people should be made to realize how absurd it is to take "one hundred thousand lives to settle a question which can be better adjusted without the loss of any."[57]

In private affairs the settlement of disputes by reference to an impartial tribunal has for centuries been an accepted principle: "the strongest minds in the world have long given their best thought to its application."[58] The invention of man which supplied

[56] Allen S. Will.

[57] Allen S. Will.

[58] John G. Murray.

the tribunal for individuals must in time prove adequate to the task of creating a similar tribunal for the nations.

The present suspicions and hostile attitude of states are portrayed in the vast war preparations and in actual conflicts. The recent decade, 1895–1905, has been the most warlike since Waterloo. "In fact the most disquieting and discouraging feature of the moral and political life of our time is the profound distrust with which the leading nations of the world regard one another."[59]

Europe has for many centuries been a greater offender in respect of war than Asia.[60] In Europe military power has long been an essential to national greatness. Japan's rapid development in the arts of peace brought to her no such recognition among the powers as did the conduct of two successful wars. A coalition of European powers seemed bent on the partition of China. Territory was seized, railway and mining concessions demanded, and the Chinese Empire actually mapped out into spheres of influence. It was only by waging war against the principal aggressor that Japan succeeded in stopping the movement.[61]

The state of war conceived by Hobbes in the *Leviathan* as the condition of man previous to the social compact is found in international relations in the twentieth century.[62] It was by surrendering certain liberties that primitive society rose out of the condition of private war, the institution of the state presupposing a tacit compact under which men mutually agree to abstain from certain acts for the sake of the general good. It was the need of defense against a common enemy more than the love of justice or desire for peace and order within the group which gave rise to primitive organization and eventually to the state. Group struggle, which arose early

[59] E. H. Griffin.
[60] F. Iyenaga.
[61] F. Iyenaga.
[62] E. H. Griffin.

in the history of animal life, called for coöperation which could only arise with the development of altruistic qualities and obedience to a common superior. The interdependence of nations has not yet reached a point where one state may not dispense with the coöperation of others. This fact helps to explain the continuance of a state of war among nations long after private war has ceased. In order to rise out of the intolerable condition of war in which the nations as such still labor, there must be a general surrender of certain privileges at present still regarded as essential elements of sovereignty. Whether it will be a group movement undertaken to protect the interests of the more liberal-minded against the stubbornness of certain powerful entities which insist on continuing in the old condition of armed peace, or whether it will develop through general coöperation of all the leading powers, depends on the men who are guiding the destinies of the several states as well as on the general public sentiment which statesmen in the end are compelled to obey. "It is through some wisely conceived application of this idea"—the idea of the surrender of certain rights by tacit or express compact such as took place when the American Union, the Swiss Confederation and the German Empire were formed—"that the peace of nations is to be safeguarded.[63] An indispensable feature of such a régime, whether it be secured by all-inclusive treaties of arbitration or by a governing council, is an international supreme court, because, subsequent to public justice is the tribunal which is to decide among the complex and varying acts of men what is just and what unjust, as well as an agreement on the standards by which the acts shall be adjudged.[64] States could safely agree to submit to such a tribunal all questions except independence. "It would certainly seem reasonable to say that, as a man may not contract himself into

[63] E. H. Griffin.
[64] E. H. Griffin.

slavery, so a nation may not submit to any tribunal the question of its own existence."[65]

The bearing of war on eugenics is disclosed by the most casual examination of history. The losses in war, both in Greece and in the Roman state, are principally responsible for the decline of Greece and Rome.[66] Mommsen estimates that three hundred thousand Italians, chiefly Romans of the best stock, perished in the Punic wars. Added to the loss in war was of course the judicial murder of the most talented and most enterprising in Greece, due to the jealousy of princes, and the wholesale proscriptions in Rome, where, on one occasion, ninety senators and twenty-six hundred knights, and on another, one hundred senators and two thousand knights were the victims. The decline of the Roman Empire was physical rather than moral; it perished because the Roman stock was killed off. This reversed selection, as David Starr Jordan has termed it, has gone on throughout European history.[67]

Internationalism was born of intercourse. It practically did not exist in the days when travel and communication were difficult and costly. Improvement of transportation, leading to the enormous steady flow of persons, commodities and ideas from nation to nation, is the force which is making for better relations between the peoples of the earth.[68] Nationality is no longer as preponderant a bond of union among men as formerly. Strata of interests, extending beyond the boundaries of the nation, constitute a warp and woof which are slowly weaving mankind into a united whole. Out of the practical need of removing hindrances to communication and of protecting property and rights beyond the borders of one's own country have grown the numerous international bureaus. Supplementing these are the societies designed to promote the interests of a particular science,

[65] E. H. Griffin.
[66] Eleanor L. Lord.
[67] Eleanor L. Lord.
[68] Henri La Fontaine.

art or industry. There exist today over three hundred international institutions, and every meeting or congress of an international character is making for peace.[69] The Central Office of International Associations at Brussels convoked in 1910 the first congress of such associations; one hundred and thirty-six separate organizations were represented. Conscious effort, supplementing the natural process, can promote and quicken the growth of international bureaus and associations.

The annual value of international commerce today is thirteen thousand five hundred million dollars, to which must be added the international transactions involved in navigation, railway traffic, telegraph, financial investments abroad, remittances on account of them, remittances by emigrants and the money expended in travel abroad.[70]

The thorough commercial organization effected by business men indicates what could be accomplished by the great world of business for peace provided it gave serious attention to the problem. In many European countries associations of business men, besides furthering local interests, are consulted through their federated organizations by the commercial and industrial departments of the government. "In Austria the Chambers are entitled to four seats in Parliament."[71] In other places they supervise "the industrial, commercial and vocational schools" and public docks. Through the International Chamber of Commerce, which is composed of the various national chambers, business men have been instrumental in having their governments call three international conferences relating to trade matters.[72]

The business man, having as his constant aim elimination of waste, sees most clearly the waste involved in war and in the preparations for war, preparations which leave the nations in the same relative

[69] Henri La Fontaine.
[70] John Ball Osborne.
[71] U. J. Ledoux.
[72] U. J. Ledoux.

position at the end of each succeeding year.[73] They see the inconsistency of preserving the natural resources of the country and piling up a legacy of debt by militarism. They recognize the interdependence of nations, the prosperity of one being reflected in the prosperity of others. They realize what ameliorations—industrial, philanthropic, and public,—would be made possible by diverting to such uses the treasure now expended on armaments. Therefore, when any practical measure is proposed, such as President Taft's all-inclusive treaty of arbitration with Great Britain, they are found zealously coöperating.[74]

The real struggle before the world is the commercial struggle. Europe is handicapped in this by the mistakes of the past. If America follows in her footsteps it will be deliberately throwing away a great advantage which it is still possible for it to enjoy.[75]

China might be saved from a similar burden by neutralization. If the great powers jointly entered into such an agreement with it, China could feel confident that the agreement would be faithfully kept, and could then bend all its energies to the development of its neglected natural resources.[76]

Heavy foreign investments make a people cautious about going to war with a country in which they have such investments.[77] The Russian loans held in France constitute a guarantee of peace equal to the "entente cordiale." In the light of this fact the present practice of discriminating against foreign securities by an extra tax and by forbidding trust estates and savings banks to hold them is impolitic.

Few nations have within themselves the resources for a protracted war. Japan would hardly have undertaken the struggle with Russia unless assured of foreign financial support. Certainly she could not have continued it for many weeks unless that support

[73] John Hays Hammond.
[74] John Hays Hammond.
[75] d'Estournelles de Constant.
[76] John Hays Hammond.
[77] James Speyer.

had been forthcoming. Therefore an agreement among the leading powers to discourage the placing of foreign war loans in the home market until the intending belligerents had exhausted peaceful methods would act as a deterrent of war.[78]

In this connection it is significant that attempts are seldom made to place government loans abroad without first securing the open approval of the chancellery of the country from which the loan is expected.

ARMAMENTS

The expenditures of the United States government on the army and navy and on pensions, the legacy of past wars, amounts to twenty-five dollars a year for every family of five persons. Inasmuch as the incidence of taxation causes this burden to fall ultimately in large part on the wage earner and so many wage earners even in our best-conditioned cities are on the border line of poverty, the tax for armaments means to them the difference between a promising and a hopeless struggle against poverty.[79]

In many cases the initial cost of a United States battleship is greater than the value of the grounds and buildings and productive funds of all the colleges and universities in the state whose name the battleship bears.[80] This is true of Oregon, New Hampshire, Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, Nebraska, Delaware, Vermont, Rhode Island, Idaho, Mississippi, North Dakota, South Carolina, West Virginia and Montana. The annual cost of maintaining the largest ships is over three quarters of a million dollars apiece. There are but few universities whose annual budget exceeds that sum. The total cost of maintaining the battleships of the United States during 1910 was a little over twenty-four and one-half million dollars. The total revenues of all the colleges and universities

[78] James Speyer.
[79] J. W. Magruder.
[80] Charles F. Thwing.

in the United States for 1909, from tuition fees and productive funds, was about twenty-five million dollars. Taking into account depreciation, the cost of the "thirty-eight battleships for a single year is greater than the administration of the entire American system of higher education."[81]

We may proceed on the assumption that the world already realizes the waste of armaments as well as the horrors and injustice of war and seeks only a means of escape from them.[82] Institutions which offer a substitute for war may be set up by a few nations and used by few or many. Progress has therefore been made along this line. The difficulty with the question of armaments is that only by joint agreement of all the great powers can their growth be arrested.

Russia issued the call for the First Hague Conference for the avowed purpose of stopping the growth of armaments. England, France, Japan and the United States would unquestionably favor concerted action directed to that end. Austria and Italy would follow the lead of their ally, Germany; and as this exhausts the list of great powers it is therefore on Germany that the world waits.

So long as Germany declines to discuss the matter of an agreement to regulate the growth of armaments the question is not a question of practical politics. If the time be ripe—as many believe it is—for such a step, it needs only some great German with a mind and heart equal to the task to lift this burden from his own country and from the world. When we remember how Germany has been trampled upon in past centuries for lack of military organization we cannot blame it for wanting a strong army and navy. But a frank discussion of plans with other nations might disclose the fact that Germany's relative strength as against probable foes is likely to remain

[81] Charles F. Thwing.

[82] Daniel Smiley.

the same after years of steady increase in military budgets and that an agreement to limit expenditures, to say the present budgets even, will leave Germany relatively just as strong and save millions to all of us.

EDUCATIONAL

The educational side of the peace movement has practical value because it must depend ultimately upon the attitude of the people whether the peace institutions which the world is endeavoring to set up will be respected and used, or whether, in moments of popular excitement, they will all be brushed roughly aside and the nations rush to war despite of them.

This education cannot begin too early in life. "As the boy stores up impressions, prejudices, sympathies, so the man legislates and the nation makes friends or foes."[83]

Of course, it is the beauty of the world and not its gloom which is to be pointed out to little children; but the peace question may be dealt with from that side. Inspiring in the child a friendly attitude toward the world, prompting it to be fair by acquiring the habit of putting itself in "the other fellow's place," showing it how much each nation owes to other nations, these are the ideas which make possible an intense patriotism without chauvinism.

While of course preserving a study of war on account of the important part it has played "in both social and national evolution" it is highly desirable to avoid the waste at present resulting from a study of the details of campaigns.[84]

Help children to realize that the lessening of suffering and saving of life are the heroic things. Cause them to feel profoundly the overwhelming importance of justice in human affairs and how little the ends of justice are served by war. "Prosperity depends on

[83] Lucia Ames Mead.

[84] Fannie Fern Andrews.

peace, and peace depends on justice, and justice depends on far-sighted organization."[85]

Is the teaching of history at all adequate unless young people are informed of the leading facts about the Hague Conventions, what they have accomplished and what their promise? Let them know how much their own country has done for peace and the things still to be striven for.[86] Young people must come to feel that only the right is in the long run the expedient; in other words, be given a moral basis which alone will enable them in times of excitement to withstand popular clamor for war.[87] There should be conveyed to them the philosophy of law and justice, its meaning in the life of every boy and girl, beginning with the laws of the schoolroom, the town and the state, and proceeding thence to the international field where the operation of justice is interrupted by war.[88] The teaching of international arbitration, humanity and brotherhood is already prescribed as part of the curriculum in the primary, secondary and normal schools of France.[89]

But it is during the college period principally that character and purpose take shape. The college and university represent homes widely scattered. They are gardens by the sea whence wind and tide carry "seeds to fructify distant lands."[90] War is emotional and thoughtless. To cultivate in men the habit of thought is to undermine the institution of war. The college preëminently stands for thought.[91] The mind of the under-graduate is in a receptive mood, ready for ideals, ready for noble causes, weighing motive and the appeals of life. "It is the dream time and yet the time when impulses harden into life purposes."[92] Great public causes which are not controversial and not ephemeral should therefore be es-

[85] Lucia Ames Mead.
[86] Lucia Ames Mead.
[87] Isaac Sharpless.
[88] Milton Fairchild.
[89] Fannie Fern Andrews.
[90] F. W. Boatwright.
[91] Charles F. Thwing.
[92] F. W. Boatwright.

poused where youth congregate, since nowhere may they be so effectively advanced.

The young are naturally combative; the doctrine of non-resistance is not apt to appeal to them.[93] But show them that here is a great cause with its roots deep down in the past, that Christianity, which moved slowly toward the abolition of the slave, is moving likewise toward the abolition of war; that causes which were formerly fought over are now settled by arbitration and inquiry; that certain definite institutions which are calculated to make war less common have actually come into being and are in operation; and let them feel that in the light of the recent past the cause does call for struggle still—long and gigantic struggle—and they will become interested.[94] Show them that today still "Nations as soon as they become self-conscious are associations of people for the purpose of taking other people's land"[95] and that it is a far cry from this to a family of nations "united in international bonds which shall make it at once the duty and the interest of each nation to seek and maintain the integrity and freedom of every other."[96] The peace movement in point of practical achievements has only just begun. Its tasks are all before it. No headway whatever has been made against armaments. To the establishment of a court of law for the nations we may look forward with confidence; but such a court cannot function wholly satisfactorily until the nations reach an agreement on the subject of the law which the court is to administer.[97] Jurists in their private capacity, though preferably in coöperation, may do much toward formulating such a law, its formal acceptance by the nations coming in good time. The firm establishment of the international court and the formulation of international practice into accepted and definitive law are two most urgent needs to which

[93] Thos. S. Baker.
[94] Thos. S. Baker.
[95] Poesche and Goepp, quoted by Thos. S. Baker.
[96] Ethelbert D. Warfield.
[97] James Brown Scott.

the coming generation must bend its energies, for "peace between nations is as impossible in the absence of law and justice, as peace is impossible among men in the absence of law and orderly administration."

Procedure, the peaceful means by which rights are preserved and wrongs redressed, must be extended into the international field.

We need furthermore a scientific study of the causes of the disease of which war is a symptom and an examination of the social cost of war in all its aspects[98]—biological, ethical and economic.

[98] James Brown Scott.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Nos. 1–48, inclusive (April, 1907–November, 1911). Including papers by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, George Trumbull Ladd, Elihu Root, Barrett Wendell, Charles E. Jefferson, Seth Low, William James, Andrew Carnegie, Philander C. Knox, Pope Pius X, and others. A list of titles and authors will be sent on application.

Special Bulletin: The Dawn of World Peace, by William Howard Taft, President of the United States. November, 1911.

In German: Deutschland und Grossbritannien; eine Studie über Nationale Eigentümlichkeiten, by Lord Haldane.

49. The Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty, by Heinrich Lammasch; and Forces Making for International Conciliation and Peace, by Jackson H. Ralston. December, 1911.

Special Bulletin: Address at Peace Dinner, December 30, by Andrew Carnegie. December, 1911.

50. Finance and Commerce: Their Relation to International Good Will; A Collection of Papers by Sereno S. Pratt, Isaac N. Seligman, E. H. Outerbridge, Thomas F. Woodlock, and George Paish. January, 1912.

51. Do the Arts Make for Peace? by Frank Jewett Mather, Jr. February, 1912.

52. An Anthropologist's View of War, by Franz Boas. March, 1912.

Special Bulletin: Great Britain and Germany; A Study in National Characteristics, by Lord Haldane. March, 1912.

53. The Mirage of the Map, by Norman Angell. April, 1912.

54. Philosophy of the Third American Peace Congress, by Theodore Marburg. May, 1912.

Up to the limit of the editions printed, any one of the above will be sent postpaid upon receipt of a request addressed to the Secretary of the American Association for International Conciliation, Postoffice Sub-station 84, New York, N. Y.

A small edition of a monthly bibliography of articles having to do with international matters is also published and distributed to libraries, magazines and newspapers.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER
RICHARD BARTHOLDT
LYMAN ABBOTT
JAMES SPEYER
STEPHEN HENRY OLIN
SETH LOW
ROBERT A. FRANKS
GEORGE BLUMENTHAL
ROBERT BACON

COUNCIL OF DIRECTION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL CONCILIATION

LYMAN ABBOTT, NEW YORK.
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, BOSTON.
EDWIN A. ALDERMAN, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.
ROBERT BACON, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
RICHARD BARTHOLDT, M. C., ST. LOUIS, MO.
GEORGE BLUMENTHAL, NEW YORK.
CLIFTON R. BRECKENRIDGE, FORT SMITH, ARKANSAS.
WILLIAM J. BRYAN, LINCOLN, NEB.
T. E. BURTON, CLEVELAND, OHIO.
NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, NEW YORK.
ANDREW CARNEGIE, NEW YORK.
EDWARD CARY, NEW YORK.
JOSEPH H. CHOATE, NEW YORK.
RICHARD H. DANA, BOSTON, MASS.
ARTHUR L. DASHER, MACON, GA.
HORACE E. DEMING, NEW YORK.
CHARLES W. ELIOT, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
JOHN W. FOSTER, WASHINGTON, D. C.
ROBERT A. FRANKS, ORANGE, N. J.
JOHN ARTHUR GREENE, NEW YORK.
JAMES M. GREENWOOD, KANSAS CITY, MO.
FRANKLIN H. HEAD, CHICAGO, ILL.
WILLIAM J. HOLLAND, PITTSBURGH, PA.
HAMILTON HOLT, NEW YORK.
DAVID STARR JORDAN, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CAL.
J. H. KIRKLAND, NASHVILLE, TENN.
ADOLPH LEWISOHN, NEW YORK.
SETH LOW, NEW YORK.
CLARENCE H. MACKAY, NEW YORK.
THEODORE MARBURG, BALTIMORE, MD.
BRANDER MATTHEWS, NEW YORK.
SILAS MCBEE, NEW YORK.
GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN, PRINCETON, N. J.
ANDREW J. MONTAGUE, RICHMOND, VA.
W. W. MORROW, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
LEVI P. MORTON, NEW YORK.
STEPHEN H. OLIN, NEW YORK.
HENRY S. PRITCHETT, NEW YORK.
A. V. V. RAYMOND, BUFFALO, N. Y.
IRA REMSEN, BALTIMORE, MD.
JAMES FORD RHODES, BOSTON, MASS.
HOWARD J. ROGERS, ALBANY, N. Y.
ELIHU ROOT, WASHINGTON, D. C.
J. G. SCHURMAN, ITHACA, N. Y.
JAMES BROWN SCOTT, WASHINGTON, D. C.
ISAAC N. SELIGMAN, NEW YORK.
F. J. V. SKIFF, CHICAGO, ILL.
WILLIAM M. SLOANE, NEW YORK.
ALBERT K. SMILEY, LAKE MOHONK, N. Y.
JAMES SPEYER, NEW YORK.
OSCAR S. STRAUS, NEW YORK.
MRS. MARY WOOD SWIFT, BERKELEY, CAL.
GEORGE W. TAYLOR, DEMOPOLIS, ALA.
O. H. TITTMAN, WASHINGTON, D. C.
W. H. TOLMAN, NEW YORK.
CHARLEMAGNE TOWER, PHILADELPHIA, PA.
BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, WASHINGTON, D. C.
EDWARD TUCK, PARIS, FRANCE.
WILLIAM D. WHEELWRIGHT, PORTLAND, ORE.

CONCILIATION INTERNATIONALE

78 BIS AVENUE HENRI MARTIN, PARIS XVI°, FRANCE

President Fondateur, BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT
Member Hague Court, Senator

Honorary Presidents: BERTHELOT and LEON BOURGEOIS, Senators

Secretaries General: A. METIN and JULES RAIS

Treasurer: ALBERT KAHN